

## REMARKS-General

By the above amendment, Applicant has amended the claims to define the invention more particularly and distinctly so as to overcome the technical rejections and define the invention patentably over the prior art.

All of the Examiner's rejections depend on Mindrum. However, Mindrum is inapposite to the current claims, as amended.

With respect to claim 1, Mindrum (step 92) discloses an input, but does not disclose step b), "determining age information from said input signal." Moreover, Mindrum also discloses display of a date of birth as the output signal (column 6, lines 28-42), but a date of birth cannot be considered as "age-event information," which according to claim 1 "comprises information regarding an event that occurred in the life of a second individual when said second individual was at an age bearing a pre-defined mathematical relationship to the age of said first individual." Moreover, a father's leaving a message for his son once he turns 18 years old (Mindrum, column 6 lines 47-64) is not age-event information, since the age of the 18-year-old son (according to the Office Action, the second individual) has no pre-defined mathematical relationship to the age of the first individual (the father). In addition, the age-event information of the application regards an event that *occurred* in the life of the second individual, while the son's birthday in Mindrum clearly is a future event.

With respect to claim 2, the "slider life line bar" of Mindrum, column 16, lines 36-54, does not qualify as a "celebrity ageliner". A "celebrity ageliner" names a celebrity and describes a historical event in the life of an individual that occurred when said

individual was the age of said celebrity on said date (claim 2). An example of a celebrity ageliner that meets the limitations of this claim is shown in figure 3 of the specification.

With respect to claim 3, the history screen (Mindrum, Fig. 20) comprises historical date and event information about an individual, but does not comprise age information or a reference to a first individual within the meaning of claim 3.

With respect to claim 4, while Mindrum, Fig. 20 contains a date (255) and event information (251) about an individual, it does not include information about an event that occurred when said (second) individual was at an age equal to the age of said first individual on said date. Moreover, the historical information (254) of Mindrum is completely independent of the individual (column 17, lines 58-60).

With respect to claim 12, Mindrum (Fig. 15) depicts historical events in the life of an individual. This is completely different from the life-chart of claim 12, which puts one or more historical events in the life of the second individual into the context of dates in the life of the first individual, by including age-event information as defined in claim 1.

Regarding claim 13, Mindrum (column 6, lines 29-46) describes a graphical life line bar, on which a slider represents the position in a *dead* individual's life at which a certain known event occurred. In the life-clock of amended claim 13, a graphical representation of the life of a living person, including estimated time remaining, is claimed. In addition, age-event information is presented on the life clock. Mindrum (column 6, lines 34-42) allows dates in this dead person's life to be selected with the slider bar, and events corresponding to that date in the dead person's life are presented. However, the definition of "age-event" makes it clear that an age-event of the current

application is an event in a second individual's life that occurred when the second individual was the same age as the first individual. Thus, the events selected with Mindrum's graphical life line slider bar are not age-events within the meaning defined under claims 1, 3, and 13.

Regarding claims 14 and 18, Mindrum's disclosure (column 6, lines 47-64) of the ability to "leave a message for his son once he turns 18 years old" does not represent the presentation of "age-event" information as defined in amended claim 14 and 18, for the same reasons as described above with respect to claim 1.

Regarding amended claims 21 and 22, the "father" of Mindrum (column 6, lines 53-55) is not at an age bearing a pre-defined mathematical relationship to the age of the second individual, James (age 5, column 10, lines 64-67), who happened to be in a picture stored in the database of Mindrum. Moreover, the 1995 NY Marathon event of Mindrum (Fig. 20), has no relationship to James, as would be necessary for this example to have any relevance to claims 21 and 22.

Claims 8-11, 15-17, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mindrum (Gordon) in view of Slotznick. However, all of these claims require the presentation of age-event information, as defined in claims 1, 14, or 18, either on electronic greeting cards or calendars. Because Mindrum does not teach the presentation of age-event information (as defined in the independent claims) in any venue (as discussed above), Applicant submits that the combination of Mindrum and Slotznick is irrelevant to a determination of obviousness of claims 8-11, 15-17, 19 and 20.

Claim 15 describes generating a celebrity ageliner, wherein said celebrity ageliner names a celebrity and describes a historical event in the life of an individual that occurred

when said individual was the age of said celebrity. Slotznick (column 5, lines 41-67) describes automatically posting transaction amounts to a user's electronic accounting software, or automating tasks such as insertion of addresses and signatures into electronic mail. Claim 15 now makes the definition of a celebrity ageliner clearer, such that Slotznick does not describe anything that resembles one.

Moreover, all dependent claims (2-13, 15-17, 19-22) are dependent on claims 1, 14, or 18, and are patentable for the same reasons that the associated independent claims are.

### **Conclusion**

For all of the above reasons, the specification and claims are in proper form, and the claims all define patentably over the prior art. Therefore, this application is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully solicited.

Very Respectfully,



Philip R Krause  
Applicant Pro Se

9437 Seven Locks Road  
Bethesda, MD 20817  
(301)-365-8555  
fax: (301)-365-8555